DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 035 701 UD 009 477

TITLE	ESEA Title I Evaluation Report, FY 1969.
INSTITUTION	Mississippi State Dept. of Education, Jackson.
PUB DATE	[69]
NOTE	8p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Involvement, Disadvantaged Youth, *Elementary School Students, *Federal Programs, Health Programs, Medical Services, *Negro Students, Nutrition, Parent Participation, Private Schools, *Reading Instruction, *Southern Schools, State Agencies, Teacher Aides
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I Program, ESEA Title I Programs, Mississippi

ABSTRACT

The Mississippi Department of Education evaluation of Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I programs covers the number of participating students, health and medical services, roles of State and Local Education Agencies, and affirms the effectiveness of the reading programs on disadvantaged students. Other topics commented on are the lack of state financial support and the participation of parents, teacher aides, and community and non public school children in the program. [Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document.] (KG)

1969

09477 E

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED035701

FY 1969

EVALUATION REPORT

E S E A

title 1

MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

G. H. JOHNSTON Supt.

UD 009477

STATE ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

FOR FY 1969

SUBMITTED TO:

Division of Compensatory Education
U. S. Office of Education, BESE
Washington, D. C. 20202

1. Provide the following basic statistics:

   A. There were 153 operating LEA's in Mississippi during school year 1968-69

   B. The number of LEA's participating in Title I during school year 1968-69

      1. There were 116 during the regular school term.

      2. There were 98 during the summer school term.

      3. There were 214 during both the regular school term and the summer term.

   C. There were 117 Title I programs during school year 1968-69

   D. Unduplicated number of pupils who participated in Title I programs.

      1. There were 264,738 enrolled in public schools.

      2. There were 1,452 enrolled in non-public schools.

      3. There were a total of 266,190 pupils enrolled in Title I programs in Mississippi during school year 1968-69

2. During school year 1969 the SEA Title I staff made 617 visits to the LEA's who were participating in Title I. By objective of the visits they were as follows:

1. Planning	26
2. Program Development	91
3. Program Operation	
a. Fiscal	311
b. Field Service (general)	131
c. Construction	32
TOTAL	591

4. Evaluation

a.	Regular State Evaluation	14
b.	USOE Sample Evaluation	12
c.	Statistical Report	--
	TOTAL	26
	GRAND TOTAL	617

The SEA Title I staff who conducted these visits is composed of nine people. They are as follows:

Coordinator
Assistant Coordinator
Supervisor of Projects and Programs
Supervisor of Fiscal Section
Two (2) Assistant Supervisors of Fiscal Section
Supervisor of Measurement & Evaluation
Two (2) Assistant Supervisors of Field Services

3. Describe any changes your Agency has made in the last three years in its procedures and the effects of such changes.

A. To improve the quality of Title I projects.

1. The LEA must show evidence of planning prior to submission of project application. Long range planning and the establishment of program priorities is encouraged.

2. In the area of project development, implementation, and evaluation, members of the SEA staff have been made available to the local districts for consultative purposes.

3. In districts where construction is planned as a part of a Title I application, the SEA has developed procedures to be followed on a step-by-step basis before approval can be given. This change has proven to be effective in assuring full utilization of funds and proper emphasis on areas of greatest need.

B. To insure proper participation of non-public school children.

The LEA's must show evidence of provision for the non-public children to participate. These activities or services must be available to those eligible non-public children.

The SEA continuously works with LEA keeping them informed of their responsibilities under ESEA Title I, for local non-public school children. The LEA can look to the Title I staff for direction and leadership in building services and activities for non-public school children.

C. The local school districts are asked to review the results obtained from the previous year's evaluation and the need assessment of children. Their using these two factors as an index, develop activities and services for children based on the degree of deficiences that have been overcome.

This year there is definite evidence that indicates greater participation and involvement of the community and local school staff in the development of new projects. This has resulted in better school community relations and acceptance of the Title I program by the general public.

4. A. What affect, if any, has Title I had upon the educational achievement of educationally deprived children including those children enrolled in non-public schools in your state?

Before Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act under Public Law 89-10 there were very few school districts in the State of Mississippi which had a district wide testing program. Today it is a different story. Many of the districts, through an intensive in-service training program for teachers, have developed effective programs of evaluation through the use of test data.

During the first and second year of the Title I there were enough established testing programs in the state to collect data which showed that the avera educationally deprived child participating in Title I schools in grades 6-9 ranged from one to four grade levels below the National Norm.

B. What are the common characteristics of those Title I projects in your state that are most effective in improving educational achievement.

There are at least six (6) types of projects in Mississippi which have proven to be most effective in improving educational achievement.

1. Health services provided the opportunity for many children in Mississippi to receive proper medical attention. The results of a good school health program are hard to measure, but observable progress by teachers and parents make this area of service most important and beneficial to children in need.

2. Developmental and Remedial Reading programs have been most effective.

3. The reduction of class size by employing additional teachers, where available, and the use of teacher-aides have allowed teachers more time to deal with the child on an individual basis. These additional teachers have allowed time for individualized instruction which builds confidence on the part of the child. The child enjoys success which helps him to feel that he belongs to the group. With small group instruction each child is permitted to progress at his own pace making the process of learning a challenge to the individual.

4. Curriculum Enrichment Materials and supplies have aided much in raising the general achievement of the educationally disadvantaged children in the State of Mississippi. Due to the lack of funds in the state from the regular appropriation for materials and supplies, we are now able to purchase the basic materials and supplies needed in the classroom to enable the teacher to do a more effective job of teaching.

5. In the State of Mississippi, libraries and resource materials were very poorly supplied even in the so called better school districts before Title I came into existence. Title I has very definitely been the answer to many school people and children's prayers. Many school districts have put strong emphasis on establishing good elementary libraries and strengthening high school libraries with good reading and reference materials. The addition of resource materials as well as plenty of good books on all reading levels has had a very definite effect on the general achievement of the educationally disadvantaged children of the State of Mississippi. We do not have actual hard data to substantiate our statements; however, the increased interest in reading has been tremendous.

6. Food service has done more in the target schools to increase school attendance than any other single service. Many school districts have reported a tremendous drop in absenteeism. There is proof that many of these educationally deprived children were actually coming to school hungry and failing in their school work. These same children, after being placed in the food service program, show a very definite change in attitude, as well as, an improvement in academic grades.

C. What evidence, if any, have you found in your state that the effectiveness of Title I projects is related to cost?

It has been observed that local school districts incorporating reading activities in projects developed under ESEA Title I show a higher degree of overcoming educational deficiencies. It is also true that supplementary services such as health and food activities greatly increase a child's acceptance of school activities. The above mentioned activities are directly related to educational achievement and cost.

The evaluation of projects also indicate that the more effective programs directly relate to the concentrations of activities on a specific few, rather than trying to work with the total population.

5. What effect, if any, has the Title I program had on the administrative structure and educational practices of:

A. State Educational Agency - The state educational agency, Title I staff, provides consultative assistance to local school districts in our endeavor to assess the needs of children. A continuous review of projects and programs is implemented by studying fiscal reports, evaluation reports, and standardized test score reporting. The SEA conducts annual district conferences for LEA in order to assist them in planning and implementing an evaluation of ESEA Title I project applications.

B. Local Education Agencies - The local school districts are aware that the SEA will stand ready to provide assistance in a consultative capacity. It has become evident that the administrative staff of local educational agencies are willing to receive assistance from the SEA for more effective utilization of Title I funds. This has resulted in a more effective program based on the needs of children. The LEA's are now concentrating on areas of greatest education deprivation. The financial ability of the local school district has been strengthened and is now about to employ certified professional staff members to implement the services incorporated in project applications. These administrative commitments have greatly facilitated and improved the educational structure of schools in Mississippi. Sound educational programs are now on the horizon for Mississippi boys and girls.

C. Non-Public Schools - It would be difficult to identify noticeable changes in the administrative structure or educational practices in the non-public schools in Mississippi. This would be directly related to the manner upon which local school districts operate.

6. Additional Efforts to Help the Disadvantaged

A. There were no state funds used to augment Title I programs in the state of Mississippi during school year 1968-69.

B. ESEA Title I has conducted many activities that have been supplemented and augmented by other federally funded programs. ESEA Title I has provided assistance to local school districts in order to construct several libraries throughout the state. ESEA Title II and NDEA Title III have co-operatively provided Federal funds for the purchase of library material and supplies.

ESEA Title I and ESEA Title III have co-operated in a number of locally conducted programs in order to provide unique experiences for the educational disadvantaged child.

ESEA Title VI and ESEA Title I have shared in a number of cases the financial responsibility for the employment of several special education teachers. This coordination and co-operation has made possible materials and activities to many boys and girls throughout the state who are in need of unique educational activities.

7. In the State of Mississippi, there are relatively few non-public school children. According to reports from the LEA's there are only 22 non-public schools in the state with a total enrollment of less than 5,000 children. Most of these children are not eligible to participate in Title I, ESEA activities.

As provided by law, all project applications must make provisions for the participation of eligible non-public school children within the project area. The actual designing, writing, and execution of Title I project activities and services is the responsibility of the LEA. In this on-going process, consultation with non-public school officials is continued in order that the needs of all educationally deprived children be considered and equitable treatment given.

In most cases, where the LEA maintains an educational materials and service center, these materials, equipment, etc., are made available during the regular school day on a loan basis. In some cases schedules are arranged to permit these children to take advantage of these services on Saturday morning and after school hours.

8. There were a number of school districts in the State of Mississippi who developed project proposals utilizing ten or more teacher aides in their system during the regular school term 1968-69. These districts did hold an organized in-service program where the teacher and the aide met and were introduced to a definite plan whereby they, as a team could more effectively carry on the work load from day-to-day. The training sessions usually ran for at least forty hours of actual team work.

The teacher assigned to work with the teacher aides were oriented with respect to organization of her classroom to utilize efficiently the time of both the teacher and the teacher aide.

The training program involved such areas as business education, preparation of educational materials, the operation of audio-visual equipment, an understanding of child growth and development, a knowledge of the policies and regulations pertaining to school lunch service, playground supervision and other activities.

There were a total of 256 teacher aides employed under ESEA Title I during school year 1968-69. All districts who had aides approved held a training program as required by law. The training sessions were so varied in length of time until it would be impossible to list each. The enrollments ranged from one (1) to twenty-one (21) in the state.

This program has proven to be very successful. With the shortage of qualified teachers, the aides seem to be the answer to the school administrator's problem in solving his staff problems. Aides serve to help teachers with many non-teaching but time consuming chores.

9. During school year 1968-69 there was a very obvious change, though small, in the number of parents involved in Title I programs of our state. The lack of communication between the school community and those responsible for the planning and financing of the school program has been a real problem. In the past, problems relating to school operations were left entirely to the school staff. Today we see that parents and the community in general can make a great contribution to the educational program.

There were at least three outstanding examples of parent and community involvement in Title I projects. These were communities with relatively high concentrations of educationally deprived children and among the larger enrollments of any of the districts of the state. These districts used almost the same approach to

the problem of involving the community. They organized classes which met at night in the target schools. The guidance counselors, teachers, administrators, school boards, etc., would meet in discussion groups from time to time. Panel discussion groups were formed to answer questions that were related to the problems faced in that school. Question and answer periods were held.

There were planning sessions held and committees elected to make recommendations to the administration and board of education. The parents were encouraged to take part in a school visitation program. Parents were also oriented as to their responsibility in an effective education program.

A very definite result of such involvement was that during the summer of 1969 there were over 100 school districts within the state conducting summer programs under Title I. These districts learned that these programs were well attended and interest on the part of students was high. Each child was allowed to select the area or areas in which he wished to participate. Staff members participating in the summer program indicated pupil participation and interest was very high.

Many of these same districts were rather hesitant to develop regular school programs that were too broad and run the risk of being short of funds to carry on summer programs in 1970.